REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been combined and this renders the rejection of claim 1 before the amendment over Kerr moot.

The rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-11 under 35 USC § 103 over Antonelli in view of Harris and/or Uchidoi is respectfully traversed.

Antonelli discloses, as the Examiner has noted, a cathodic electrocoating composition. By definition, that means the composition is acidic so that the polymer coating is deposited elecrophoretically at the cathode of the bath. See, column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 6. As pointed out in Harris, such compositions employ a principal resin having amine functionality which is neutralized by acid. Column 1, lines 30-35. One skilled in the art would therefore immediately recognize that the reference in Antonelli to a basic pH of up to 8, as recited in column 2, at line 36, was a clear typographic error. A bath having a pH of 8 would be an anodic composition in which the polymer coating is deposited on the anode, and would not act as a cathodic composition. In the Antonelli examples, for instance, the pH ranges from 5.99 to 6.09. While the Office Action makes reference to a "synthesis 5" in which the composition has a pH of 7.7, Applicants cannot locate any such teaching in Antonelli. There is nothing in Antonelli which suggests converting any disclosed composition into an anodic electrocoating composition. For instance, the invention of Antonelli concerns the neutralizing agent used to overcome the basic characteristic of the amine functionality of the principal resin. The pH and operating conditions of anodic and cathodic baths are significantly different. The reference does not suggest an anodic compostion.

The cathodic electrocoating composition of Antonelli is an aqueous composition containing a principal emulsion of binder, pigment, organic coalescent solvents and optionally other additives. See, column 1, lines 35-38 and column 2, lines 44-50. Harris likewise relates to cathodic electrocoating compositions containing organic coalescent solvents. Column 7, lines 29 et seq. A similar teaching can be found in Uchidoi at column 1, lines 29-30 and column 2, line 59 and column 10, line 5 et seq.

In the present invention, an anodic composition is provided. To achieve this, the pH is 7.8 or higher, achieved by adding base (such as 2-amino-2-methyl- 1-propanol) to control the charge on the polymer particles. The composition is essentially free of organic solvent (page 5, end of last full paragraph). When these features and the other requirement of the claims are met, there is a rapid removal of water and formation of a coherent coating by crosslinking upon heating at a temperature much lower than usually employed. Nothing in the prior art makes these results predicable.

The type of composition is different from the combination of references, and the components of the composition, as well as the results achieved, are different. According, the claims define an unobvious invention.

The rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC § 103 over Antonelli in view of Harris and/or Uchidoi in further view of Kerr is also respectfully traversed.

The combination of Antonelli, Harris and Uchidoi has been discussed above. Kerr has not been cited to cure any deficiencies in that combination, and a rejection additionally employing this patent (which also uses organic solvent) cannot render this dependent claim obvious.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: December 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By

Edward A. Meilman
Registration No.: 24,735
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant